
1 **FACULTY SENATE** **SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY**

2
3 **FACULTY SENATE BILL 23-A-7**

4
5 Approved by the Faculty Senate XXXXXX

6
7 **BRIEF SUMMARY:** Removal of language concerning chairperson evaluation and referral to
8 Department Chairperson section of handbook (Chapter 2, Faculty Merit Pay Policy).

9
10
11 **ACTION OF BILL** (REVISING “Faculty Merit Pay” language in the Faculty Handbook to
12 remove chairperson review language)

13
BE IT RESOLVED: subject to the passage and approval of this bill, Chapter 2, Faculty Merit
Pay Policy of the *Faculty Handbook* be amended by replacing the existing content with the
following:

14 **TITLE OF BILL (Faculty Merit Pay) Post Professorial Merit (see Faculty Tenure and**
15 **Promotion Policy)**

16
17 **Chapter 2, Faculty Merit Pay Policy**

18 Faculty Merit Pay Policy

19 Faculty Senate Bill 23-A-7 begins here.

20 **Underlying Principles**

- 21 1. The established mechanisms of awarding tenure, promotion, and post professorial merit (see
22 Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy) serve, among other purposes, to provide periodic salary
23 increases to those tenured and tenure-track faculty whose performance, measured against
24 departmental or unit criteria, is determined to meet certain levels for certain periods of time, and
25 who are otherwise eligible. Those mechanisms provide a type of "merit pay" system for certain
26 faculty.
- 27 2. This Faculty Merit Pay Policy is intended to provide a type of "merit pay" system for all full-time
28 faculty, regardless of whether they are eligible for the additional rewards of tenure, promotion, or
29 post-professorial merit.
- 30 3. The objectives of this policy include the following:
31 a) to provide a mechanism for determining that a faculty member's annual performance, ~~including~~
32 ~~chairpersons~~, is satisfactory, in that it has met certain defined minimum expectations for
33 performance,
34 b) to provide a mechanism of awarding annual salary increases to satisfactorily-performing
35 faculty members, and

- 36 c) to provide a mechanism of awarding periodic larger salary increases to non-tenure track faculty
37 whose performance warrants such recognition.
- 38 4. The provisions of this policy shall be applicable to all full-time faculty members, as well as dual
39 appointment faculty (to be considered in the base department only) and those faculty members
40 with 50 percent or less released time for administrative responsibilities.
- 41 5. This policy provides for the establishment of two sets of departmental performance criteria, one
42 for each of the two programs set out below. Department criteria will be discipline specific and
43 performance based. They will include specific indicators of faculty performance in the areas of
44 teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service to the university, as appropriate to the
45 individual faculty member's contract status. Where appropriate, criteria should be designed not
46 only to reward individual achievement but also to reward contributions of individuals as members
47 of the department team. Nothing in the criteria may contradict other provisions of the Faculty
48 Handbook. Until such time as new or revised criteria are approved, existing criteria remain in
49 force.
- 50 6. In addition to the two programs described under this policy, there exists a third merit pay program
51 that is applicable only to those faculty members who hold the rank of Professor. This Post-
52 Professorial Merit Pay program is described under the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy.;
53 ~~because it utilizes promotion criteria, calendar, and processes.~~

54 **Faculty Annual Merit Program**

55 **Development of Annual Performance Criteria.** The full-time faculty of each academic department or
56 equivalent unit shall as a whole develop, approve, and publish criteria that define minimum annual
57 expectations for performance by the individual faculty member. Criteria must be applicable to both non-
58 tenure track faculty as well as to tenure-track or tenured faculty, though the criteria and expectations need
59 not be the same. ~~Criteria must also be applicable to department chairpersons and should incorporate the~~
60 ~~administrative responsibilities of those positions. These administrative responsibilities shall be developed~~
61 ~~by the department in partnership with the dean, and forwarded to the Provost for approval~~

62 **Annual Performance Evaluation.** The full-time faculty of each academic department or equivalent unit
63 shall as a whole determine and publish the process to be used to conduct the annual evaluation of faculty
64 member performance. Annual evaluations shall be conducted according to the procedures and calendar set
65 out below.

66 For evaluation of the ~~chair~~ chairperson, See Department Chairpersons (Chapter 1) for modifications of the
67 procedure below. ~~, both the department and the dean will evaluate the chair's performance based on the~~
68 ~~developed criteria. The department will forward their written evaluation and recommendation to the~~
69 ~~dean. If dean's evaluation is not in agreement with that of the department, the dean will forward all~~
70 ~~evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the chair if the chair so chooses, to the provost.~~
71 ~~The provost shall provide a resolution that will be forwarded to the president and involved parties.~~
72 Evaluation of faculty members is conducted by department committee, designee, or chairperson as
73 agreed upon by the department. If conducted by a committee or designee, the annual report is also
74 made available to the department chairperson for optional review and comments prior to
75 communication of results to the faculty member.

76 ~~In the evaluation of faculty members, other than the chair, the department faculty as a whole may choose~~
77 ~~to evaluate faculty by a designated departmental committee or delegate to the chair the evaluation of the~~
78 ~~department faculty.~~

79 In the case of review by committee or designee, results and justification are communicated to the faculty
80 member and chairperson in writing. In the case of review by the chairperson, results and justification are
81 communicated in writing to the faculty member.

82 If the reviewing party and the faculty member agree with the evaluation results, the process is concluded
83 and results are forwarded to the college dean.

84 If the reviewing party and faculty member are not in agreement: in the case of committee or designee
85 review of annual performance, the faculty member or chairperson can request clarification from the
86 department committee or designee. In the case of chairperson review of annual performance, the faculty
87 member can request clarification from the chairperson.

88 If no resolution can be obtained, the faculty member or chairperson can appeal to the college T&P
89 committee.

90 The college committee's recommendation, along with the evaluation and justification, shall be
91 communicated in writing to the faculty member and the department chairperson. Within the indicated
92 time, the department chairperson may make an inquiry to the department committee, or where
93 appropriate, the college tenure and promotion advisory committee regarding the evaluation of a specific
94 faculty member, and that committee will provide a response.

95 If the chairperson is not in agreement with that evaluation, the chairperson shall forward all written
96 evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the faculty member, if the faculty member so
97 chooses, to the dean.

98 ~~cases where the evaluation of a faculty member is done by a department committee, the recommendation~~
99 ~~of that committee, along with the evaluation and justification, shall be communicated in writing to the~~
100 ~~faculty member and the department chairperson chair. If the faculty member is not in agreement with the~~
101 ~~decision, they he/she may request a review from the college tenure and promotion committee. The~~
102 ~~college committee's recommendation, along with the evaluation and justification, shall be communicated~~
103 ~~in writing to the faculty member and the department chairperson chair. Within the indicated time period,~~
104 ~~the department chairperson chair may make an inquiry to the department committee, or where~~
105 ~~appropriate, the college tenure and promotion advisory committee regarding the evaluation of a specific~~
106 ~~faculty member, and that committee will provide a response. If the chairperson chair is not in agreement~~
107 ~~with that evaluation, the chairperson chair shall forward all written evaluations and justifications, and a~~
108 ~~written response from the faculty member, if the faculty member so chooses, to the dean. The dean shall~~
109 ~~provide a resolution that shall be forwarded to the provost and the involved parties. (For Kent Library~~
110 ~~faculty, the appellate body shall be the university tenure and promotion advisory committee, which shall~~
111 ~~fill the same roles as those filled by the college tenure and promotion advisory committee for non-library~~
112 ~~faculty.)~~

113 ~~In cases where the department faculty as a whole has delegated to the chair the evaluation of the faculty~~
114 ~~member, the chair's recommendation, along with the evaluation and justification, shall be communicated~~

115 ~~in writing to that faculty member. If that faculty member is not in agreement with the recommendation,~~
116 ~~he/she may request a review from the college tenure and promotion committee. The college committee's~~
117 ~~recommendation, along with the evaluation and justification, shall be communicated in writing to the~~
118 ~~faculty member and the department chair. If the chair is not in agreement with that evaluation, the chair~~
119 ~~shall forward all written evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the faculty member, if~~
120 ~~the faculty member so chooses, to the dean.~~

121 The dean shall provide a resolution that shall be forwarded to the provost and the involved parties. (For
122 Kent Library faculty, the appellate body shall be the university tenure and promotion advisory committee,
123 which shall fill the same roles as those filled by the college tenure and promotion advisory committee for
124 non-library faculty.)

125 Each faculty member determined to have met the minimum expectations for performance as defined by
126 the criteria, shall receive the standard increase to base salary. ~~(It should be understood that continuous~~
127 ~~(Continuous performance that meets minimum expectations as defined by departmental criteria does not~~
128 ~~assure tenure, promotion, or post-professorial merit.)~~

129 The annual review will identify faculty who are meeting minimum expectations, as determined by
130 departmental criteria. These faculty will receive a salary increase funded by a pool consisting of at least
131 87.5 percent of the aggregate amount of each year's faculty salary increase determined through the annual
132 budget review process. Promotions to Associate Professor and Professor shall be funded as a "cost of
133 continuing", determined by the annual budget review process.

134 *Amended by Faculty Senate Bill 11-A-28, May, 4, 2011, reviewed by President May 2011, approved by*
135 *Board of Regents May 13, 2011*

136 **Calendar for Annual Performance Program.**

137 The performance evaluation process shall be conducted according to this calendar:

138 **January 31:** Faculty reports are due for accomplishments and contributions of the previous year.

139 **February 1 - March 1:** Notices of departmental committee recommendations regarding performance
140 meeting or not meeting minimum expectations are communicated in writing to faculty. ~~In the case of the~~
141 ~~chair evaluation, the departmental committee shall forward their written evaluation to the dean. The dean~~
142 ~~will then communicate the recommendation regarding performance meeting or not meeting minimum~~
143 ~~expectations to the chair. During this same time period, in the cases where a chair has been delegated the~~
144 ~~responsibility of evaluating faculty members, the chair shall communicate in writing his/her evaluation~~
145 ~~and justification to the faculty members. The faculty body evaluating the chairperson's teaching~~
146 ~~effectiveness, professional growth, and service shall convey their recommendation to the college dean. In~~
147 ~~cases where a chairperson has been delegated the responsibility of evaluating faculty members, the~~
148 ~~chairperson shall communicate in writing their evaluation and justification to the faculty members.~~
149 ~~Additionally, in such cases the chairperson shall not receive their overall evaluation from the dean until~~
150 ~~after the chairperson has completed and communicated all faculty evaluations. In all cases, the faculty~~
151 ~~member will acknowledge receipt of evaluation recommendations in writing.~~

152

153 **March 2-March 12:** Within this time period, a faculty member, who is not in agreement with their
154 evaluation by the department committee or chairperson, may appeal that evaluation to the college
155 tenure and promotion advisory committee. ~~Within this time period, in cases where the dean's evaluation~~
156 ~~is not in agreement with the department's evaluation, the dean will forward all evaluations and~~
157 ~~justifications, and a written response from the chairperson chair if the chairperson chair so chooses, to the~~
158 ~~provost. Also, during this time period, in the case of a faculty member evaluated by a department~~
159 ~~committee, the department chairperson chair may make an inquiry to that committee regarding the~~
160 ~~evaluation of a specific faculty member, and the committee will provide a response. Also, during this~~
161 ~~time period, a faculty member, who is not in agreement with his/her evaluation by the department~~
162 ~~committee or chairperson chair, may appeal that evaluation to the college tenure and promotion advisory~~
163 ~~committee.~~

164 **March 13- April 15:** Appeals made to the college tenure and promotion advisory committee shall be
165 decided and the evaluation and justification communicated in writing to the faculty member and to the
166 department chairperson chair. During this time, if the chairperson chair is not in agreement with an
167 evaluation from either the department committee or college tenure and promotion committee, the
168 chairperson chair shall forward all written evaluations and justifications, and a written response from the
169 faculty member, if the faculty member so chooses, to the dean. The dean shall provide a resolution that
170 shall be forwarded to the provost and the involved parties.

171 **Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit Program**

172 ***Development of Criteria for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit.*** In addition, the full-time faculty of each
173 department or equivalent unit shall as a whole develop and approve criteria for periodic recognition of
174 non-tenure track faculty. These criteria shall reflect higher than minimum performance, similar to the way
175 that tenure, promotion, and post-professorial merit criteria (see Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy)
176 reflect higher than minimum performance. For a period of three years following the final approval of a
177 revision of these criteria, a faculty member applying for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit may elect to be
178 evaluated by the previous criteria ~~instead of the new ones.~~

179 ***Performance Evaluation for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit.*** The full-time faculty of each academic
180 department or equivalent unit shall as a whole determine the process to be used to conduct the separate
181 periodic evaluation of the performance of eligible non-tenure track faculty members. An individual non-
182 tenure track faculty member is eligible to apply for periodic Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit in the fourth
183 year of full-time employment and each four years after having received such recognition. The evaluation
184 shall be conducted according to the calendar set out below. Each faculty member determined to have met
185 the expectations for performance as defined by the criteria, shall receive an increase to base salary.

186 For non-tenure track merit, the amount of the base pay increase (see table below) shall be reviewed
187 during the fiscal year ~~2010~~ budget review process and ~~even every two~~ years thereafter.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty Merit

**Monetary Amounts ~~for Fiscal Years 2013 to 2017 as of~~
Fiscal Year 2013**

Date and Version: 2/21/2024 Version 5
Handbook Section: Faculty Merit Pay
Proposed Change: Edits to Handbook Language for Clarity and Conciseness
Source of Bill: Professional Affairs/ Governance Committees

<u>Level</u>	<u>Base Pay Increase</u>
Non-Tenure Track	\$2500

188
189
190
191

*Approved by Faculty Senate Bill 12-A-4 February 15, 2012, Reviewed by President February 2012,
Approved by Board of Regents June 20, 2012, Approved by Faculty Senate Bill 15-A-4 on 2/25/15,
Reviewed by President 4/14/15, Approved by Board of Regents 5/8/15*

192

<u>Action</u>	<u>Date</u>
Introduced to Senate	2/28/2024
Second Senate Meeting	
Faculty Senate Vote	
President's Review	
Board of Regents Approval	
Posted to Faculty Handbook	

Action

193